

Appln No. 10/760243
Amdt. Dated: October 03, 2006
Response to Office Action of July 26, 2006

5

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Examiner's further Office Action of July 26, 2006, the Applicant respectfully submits the accompanying Amendment to the claims and the below Remarks.

Regarding Amendment

In the Amendment:

independent claim 1 is amended to clarify that the support member of each printhead module commonly supports the printhead integrated circuits of the respective printhead modules. Support for this amendment can be found at page 6, lines 33-39 and page 9, line 28-page 11, line 29 of the present specification; and

dependent claims 2-8 are unchanged.

It is respectfully submitted that the above amendments do not add new matter to the present application.

Regarding 35 USC 102(b) Rejections

It is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of amended independent claim 1, and claims 3-8 dependent therefrom, is not disclosed by Silverbrook, for at least the following reasons.

In the present Office Action, the Examiner has modified their interpretation of Silverbrook in order to assert that the element 12 of Silverbrook corresponds to the claimed printhead modules. In the interpretation however, the Examiner also asserts that the element 32 of Silverbrook corresponds to the claimed support members of the printhead modules.

This interpretation is not possible however, as has been previously discussed by the Applicant in the prosecution of the present application, because the element 32 of Silverbrook (being the reservoir molding 32) is a part of the printhead assembly 10 which is separate from each of the elements 12 (being the printhead modules 12), and thus is not comprised in the element 12 as is required by the claimed invention (see col. 2, lines 17-26 of Silverbrook). Thus,

Appln No. 10/760243
Amdt. Dated: October 03, 2006
Response to Office Action of July 26, 2006

6

As discussed above, independent claim 1 has been further amended to clarify that the support member of each printhead module commonly supports the printhead integrated circuits of the respective printhead module. Accordingly, as claimed, the channels of the support members are configured to not only carry printing fluid for the printhead integrated circuits directly supported thereby, but also for the printhead integrated circuits of the support member(s) of the adjacent printhead module(s).

In this way, the printhead assembly can be easily scaled up in length by simply arranging additional printhead modules. This arrangement is clearly described at page 6, lines 33-39 and page 9, line 28-page 11, line 29 of the present specification.

On the other hand, in Silverbrook, since it is the element 32 of the printhead assembly 10 which is arranged to carry ink for all of the elements 12, it is only possible to consider the Examiner's interpretation if the printhead assembly 10 of Silverbrook is considered to correspond with the claimed printhead module(s) (see col. 2, lines 6-8 and 20-27 of Silverbrook).

However, as can be clearly seen from Fig. 15 of Silverbrook, when multiple printhead assemblies 10 are arranged together, the ink is not communicated directly between the elements 32, rather individual ink supply hoses 118 are used to individually supply ink to each printhead assembly 10, such that Silverbrook does not disclose, or suggests, to connect an ink supply hose to only one of the printhead assemblies 10 as is required by the claimed invention (see also col. 7, line 38-col. 8, line 5 of Silverbrook).

Thus, the subject matter of amended independent claim 1, and claims 2-8 dependent therefrom, is not disclosed, or suggested, by Silverbrook.

Regarding 35 USC 103(a) Rejections

It is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of dependent claims 2 and 4, is not taught or suggested by Silverbrook in view of Milan and/or Lu, because as previously discussed by the Applicant in the prosecution of the present application, Milan and Lu do not make up for the above-discussed deficiencies in Silverbrook.

Appln No. 10/760243
Amdt. Dated: October 03, 2006
Response to Office Action of July 26, 2006

7

Thus, the subject matter of amended independent claim 1, and claims 2-8 dependent therefrom, is not disclosed or suggested by Silverbrook either taken alone or in combination with Milan and/or Lu.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's rejections have been traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Very respectfully,

Applicant/s:



Kia Silverbrook



Norman Micheal Berry



Garry Raymond Jackson



Akira Nakazawa

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762